## REMARKS

Claims 1, 6-8, 13-15, 18-22 and 24 are all the claims pending in the application.

Claims 1, 6-8, 13-15, 18-22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yousefi'zadeh, (U.S. Patent No. 6,950,848; hereinafter "Yousefi'zadeh") in view of Guenther et al, (U.S. Patent No. 6,134,588; hereinafter "Guenther"), in further view of Albert et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,549,516; hereinafter "Albert").

Applicant traverses the rejection as follows.

Claim 1 recites, inter alia, "wherein the at least one port module sends an error message to the interface module indicating the unavailability of the data source, reestablishes a connection with the data source, and reconnects the remote application to the data source directly communicating with the remote application, and wherein the at least one port module bypasses the connection manager in the subsequent request." Claims 8 and 15 recite features similar to claim 1.

In page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that Yousefi'zadeh does not teach or suggest the feature of "wherein the at least one port module bypasses the connection manager in the subsequent request," but the Examiner relies on column 13, lines 4-8 of Albert for allegedly disclosing these features. Applicant respectfully disagrees for at least the following reasons.

Albert relates to providing network services such as load balancing, packet filtering or Network Address Translation (NAT). Albert discloses a system that includes

a service manager that determines how a network service is provided for a data flow and sends instructions to routers that detect packets for the data flow when such packets are actually detected by the routers (column 2, lines 12-20). However, Albert does not teach or suggest "wherein the at least one port module bypasses the connection manager in the subsequent request."

Specifically, Albert discloses that if future packets in either flow sent from the client or host match the affinity key in one of the fixed affinities and are handled by the forwarding agent in accordance with the fixed affinity, then it is not necessary to forward the packet to the service manager (column 13, lines 4-8). Here, Albert merely discloses that it is not necessary for a packet having a matching affinity key within a data flow to be forwarded to the service manager. However, Albert is not at all concerned with **the subsequent request for the data source**, as recited in claim 1.

For instance, according to claim 1, the at least one port module **bypasses** the connection manager **in the subsequent request for the data source**. That is, the connection manager is bypassed **in the subsequent request for the data source**. On the other hand, Albert at most discloses that it is not necessary to forward packets that are already in the flow. The packets of Albert are not **requests for the data source**, as recited in claim 1. As such, future packets are not **subsequent request for the data source**. Accordingly, Albert does not teach or suggest "wherein the at least one port module bypasses the connection manager in the subsequent request."

Furthermore, in page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that Yousefi'zadeh does not teach or suggest "wherein the at least one port module sends an

error message to the interface module indicating the unavailability of the data source,"
but contends that FIG. 6 of Guenther allegedly discloses these features. Applicant
respectfully disagrees for at least the following reasons.

In FIG. 6, Guenther discloses a flowchart of Renew HAL (Hostname Address
List) routine of the Hostname Process that provides an up-to-date HAL for use.
However, FIG. 6 does not teach or suggest "wherein the at least one port module sends an
error message **to the interface module indicating the unavailability of the data
source**."

In particular, Guenther discloses that the routine begins at step 92 by going
through the HAL entries for the HAL returned. If the timestamp is older than Tx, then
Status is set to "OK". At step 94, a test is performed to determine whether the list is a
random list. If the outcome of the test at step 94 indicates that the list is not a random
list, then the HAL is a primary/backup list. Further, if the outcome of a test at step 104
indicates that the list is older than Tz, or after step 108 for rebuilding HAL, the routine
continues at step 110 to locate the first "OK" entry, which is then set to "Current." If no
entry is "Current", the routine branches to step 112 and returns an error (column 7, lines
27-53). However, there is no teaching or suggestion of "wherein the at least one port
module sends an error message to the interface module indicating the unavailability of
the data source."

In the above discussed portion corresponding to Fig. 6, Guenther merely discloses
that if no entry is "Current", then the routine returns an error. However, there is no

teaching or suggestion of (i) an error message being sent **to the interface module** and (ii) and error message **indicating the unavailability of the data source**.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 8 and 15 are patentable over the cited combination of references.

Claims 6-7, 13-14, 18-22 and 24 that depend from claims 1, 8 and 15 are patentable over the cited combination of references at least by virtue of their dependency and the additional features recited therein.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ebenesar D. Thomas/
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC                     Ebenesar D. Thomas
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.         Registration No. 62,499
Washington, DC 20037
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Date: February 28, 2012